

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1-21 are rejected. Claim 9 has been amended to correct a typographical error of missing punctuation. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the remarks set forth below.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7, 9-13, and 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,706,456 to Dupper et. al. (hereinafter “Dupper”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,678,039 to Hinks et. al. (hereinafter “Hinks”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Dupper discloses a desktop programmable Graphical User Interface (GUI) desktop workstation that includes a GUI which provides an end user with an interface to their application specific process. Hinks discloses a Software Translation Kit having a shell coupled to an Export/Import module. In Hinks, the Export/Import module itself includes a parsing engine to extract strings and translatable information from application programs. Neither Dupper, Hinks, nor the combination of Dupper and Hinks teach all the claim limitations of claims 1-7, 9-13, and 15-21.

Claim 1 recites specifications that identify processing properties for processing services to define the execution of a batch application. In support of the rejection for this claim limitation, the Examiner relies on the icons on the template defining processes in Dupper. Dupper teaches a programmable GUI with user defined icons and buttons for integration of standard workstation products and applications. These button and icons initiate the execution of interactive applications such as e-mail and word processing (col.

2, line 65 to col. 3, line 14). In contrast, claim 1 recites the execution of a *batch* application, which is not taught or suggested in Dupper.

Additionally, claim 1 also recites a processing subsystem adapted to perform processing of the batch application according to a user defined version of the template.

The Examiner has cited the processing unit 604 of Dupper to teach this claim limitation.

As depicted in FIG. 6 of Dupper, the processing unit 604 is a whole computer system. On the other hand, a subsystem can be a component of a computer system such as a software program or a module. A computer system may include multiple subsystems. For example, in the present application, FIG. 2 depicts a client computer 111 that includes three subsystems: design tool subsystem 210, processing subsystem 211, and client middleware subsystem 212. Therefore, the processing unit 604 of Dupper does not teach a processing subsystem as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, as discussed above, Dupper does not teach or suggest that the processing subsystem performs processing of batch applications as stated in claim 1.

Claim 1 also recites a middleware subsystem providing communication of the specifications from the design tool subsystem to the processing subsystem. The Office Action fails to recite in any specificity where this middleware subsystem is taught in Dupper. Instead, the Office Action merely recites the “parts of the system that enable the communication of the GUI design system to the processing system” without providing any specific reference in Dupper. The Office Action does recite col. 3, line 22-col. 7, line 9 of Dupper, but this cited portion of Dupper is almost the entire portion of the detailed description. In this cited portion, applicants fail to see any teaching of a middleware subsystem as recited in claim 1. Therefore, absent any teaching or suggestion of a

middleware subsystem in the detailed description of Dupper, claim 1 is allowable for at least the reasons stated above over Dupper.

Claim 2 is dependent from claim 1 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 3 and 4 are dependent on claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. In support of this rejection, the Office Action relies on Hinks' system for translating software applications. In regards to claim 3, the Examiner relies on the translation table database 340 in Hinks to teach the processing subsystem. However, a closer reading of Hinks in col. 7, line 65 to col. 8, line 5 reveals that the translation table database 340 is merely a database table for storage of information. Applicants fail to see how processing can occur in a database table, especially processing of batch applications as recited in the limitations of claim 3. Regarding claim 4, the Office Action recites col. 7, lines 7-52 that teaches a Translation Table. However, this Translation Table, similar to the translation table database 340, is merely a database table that does not perform processing by the processing subsystem as recited in claim 4. Therefore, Hinks does not teach the claim limitations of claim 4.

Claims 5, 6, and 9 are dependent either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Additionally, the Examiner has cited the TSHELL 310 in Hinks to teach the database middleware subsystem of claim 5 and the input-output database middleware subsystem of claim 6 and 9. Hinks in col. 7, lines 55-57 describes the TSHELL 310 as "a common front end and user interface to the translators." Applicants fail to see how a user interface qualifies as teaching or suggesting

any sort of a middleware subsystem. Therefore, the TSHELL 310 of Hinks does not teach or suggest any sort of middleware subsystem as recited in claims 5, 6, and 9.

Claim 7 is dependent on claim 1 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

The Office Action recites that the motivation to combine Dupper and Hinks is that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to place the definable GUI of Dupper in a networked system of Hinks. Applicants respectfully disagree with this motivation to combine. The purpose of Hinks is to translate applications into target languages, while the purpose of Dupper is to create a definable GUI based on the end user's job function. These two purposes are separate and unrelated. One of ordinary skill in the art would not combine Dupper and Hinks because translating applications is not related to creation of programmable GUIs that are application specific. Furthermore, translation of applications and creation of programmable GUIs are not even related to the execution of batch applications of claims 3-7 and 9. Therefore, claims 3-7 and 9 are allowable for at least the above reasons.

Claim 10 recites the step of identifying processing properties for the processing services to define the execution of a batch application and sending the template to a processing subsystem for processing the batch application according to a user defined version of the template. As stated above, Dupper does not teach or suggest executing or processing the batch application. Also, as stated above, Dupper does not teach or suggest a processing subsystem for processing the batch application. Therefore, claim 10 is allowable for at least the above reasons.

Claims 11-13 and 15 are dependent from claim 10 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 10. The same argument above for not combining Dupper and Hinks also applies to claims 11-13 and 15. In regards to claims 11, 12, and 15, the Examiner relies on the TSHELL 310 of Hinks to teach the middleware subsystem. The above stated argument that Hinks does not teach or suggest characterizing the TSHELL 310 as any sort of middleware subsystem also applies to claims 11, 12, and 15.

Claim 16 recites specifications identifying processing properties for the processing services to define the execution of a batch application, processing means responsive to the template for processing the batch application, and middleware means for communicating information including said set of specifications between the plurality of computers. As stated above, Dupper does not teach or suggest executing or processing of batch applications. Also, Dupper does not teach or suggest middleware means for communicating information including the set of specifications between the plurality of computers. Instead, Dupper teaches a programmable GUI for a single desktop workstation. Applicants fail to see how Dupper with a single desktop workstation teaches communicating between a plurality of computers as recited in claim 16. Therefore, claim 16 is allowable for at least the above reasons.

Claims 17 and 18 are dependent from claim 16 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 16. Additionally, the same argument for not combining Dupper and Hinks also applies to claims 17 and 18.

Claim 19 recites the steps of identifying processing properties for the processing services to define the execution of a batch application, processing the batch application in accordance with a user defined version of the template on a further one of the computers,

and communicating information including the set of specifications between the plurality of computers. As stated above, Dupper does not teach or suggest executing or processing of batch applications. Also, as stated above, Dupper does not teach or suggest communicating information including the set of specifications between the plurality of computers as recited in claim 19. Therefore, claim 19 is allowable for at least the above reasons.

Claims 20 and 21 are dependent from claim 19 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 19. Additionally, the same argument for not combining Dupper and Hinks also applies to claims 20 and 21.

Claims 8 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,706,456 to Dupper et. al. (hereinafter “Dupper”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,678,039 to Hinks et. al. (hereinafter “Hinks”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 8 is dependent from claim 1 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claim 14 is dependent from claim 10 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 10. Therefore, claims 8 and 14 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Therefore, in view of the above remarks this application is in condition for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to allow this application. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative regarding any issues that the Examiner feels are still outstanding.

Respectfully submitted,

Shisler et al.

Date: 12/5/03

By: Eugene G. Kim

Eugene G. Kim

Carr & Ferrell LLP

2200 Geng Road

Palo Alto, California 94303

Phone: (650) 812-3400

Fax: (650) 812-3444